

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated October 9, 2007, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the specification and claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

The specification was objected to because of certain informalities. Specifically, the Office Action asserted that on page 10 of the present application, the number 30 should be number 20 based on Fig. 2. In response, the specification has been amended to replace the number 30 with number 20 as requested by the Office Action. As such, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons

Claims 1-4 were original claims. The current amendments thereto do not adversely affect the claims' compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112. Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claim 6 is supported in the specification. See at least page 5, lines 18-19, of the present application. Claim 7 is supported in the specification. See at least page 5, line 19, of the present application. On page 2 of the Office Action, the Office Action identified several issues and requested clarification.

First, the Office Action indicated that pages 8-11 of the present application do not provide the same sequence as the sequence described on pages 6-7 of the present application. However, on page 8-11, the present application does not provide the same

sequence. Instead, using Fig. 2, the sequence is 13, 11, and then 14. Thus, pages 8-11 of the present application do provide the same sequence as the sequence described on pages 6-7 of the present application.

Specifically, Page 6, lines 24-27, of the present application describes that the order management terminal 10 has production plan creation means 11, required quantity determination means 12, first ordering means 13, correction means 14, and second ordering means 15. However, the present application does not explicitly describe that the terminal 10 contains all the-above identified elements in specific sequence. Further, even if all the elements of Fig. 1 are in sequence, Fig. 2 clearly shows first production plan s1, determine first required quantity s2, determine first order quantity s3, order placement, correction means, and determining latest order quantity s6, and they are in the same sequence as shown in Fig. 1.

Second, the Office Action took the position that the relationship between the dates and quantities described in Fig. 3 and the order amounts in Fig. 4 are not supported by the specification. There is no specific relationship between the dates and quantities described in Fig. 3 and the order amounts in Fig. 4. As described in the specification, on page 10, line 27 to page 11, line 4, Fig. 3 shows creating a new production plan from August 2. Fig. 3 shows displaying an order management table in the order received management terminal 10. See at least page 11, lines 23-27 of the present application. Thus, there is no specific relationship between Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 because Fig. 4 merely illustrates displaying the order management table.

Third, the Office Action also asserted that page 12 of the present application does not explain what are a first pre-determined period and a second pre-determined period. However, at least paragraph [0042] describes what the first predetermined period and the second pre-determined period are. It is respectfully noted that a first pre-determined period and a second pre-determined period are fully supported in the description at least in paragraphs [0041] to [0044] of the present application. Paragraphs [0041] to [0044] describe that "the first predetermined period" and order quantities are modifiable in a plurality of periods (order numbers 05 to 08) in "the second predetermined period." In addition, "the second predetermined period" is unmodifiable. Fig. 4(b) further explains that the order quantity of the order number 01 is set to "modifiable," the latest required quantity of order number 03 is determined to be "1,000" and its order quantity is set to "modifiable," and the latest required quantities of order numbers 05 and 07 are determined to be "400" and "500" respectively according to a user's intention. The second ordering information indicating the latest order quantities obtained are created by modifying the placed order quantities.

Fourth, the Office Action took the position that page 12 of the present application does not explain why it would be necessary to allocate an option of modifiable or unmodifiable. The arguments presented above supporting the patentability are incorporated herein.

Fifth, the Office Action indicated that page 12 of the present application does not explain what is meant by a period. A period is a length of time. The periods are

described in several places in the specification. See at least paragraph [0056] of the present application. As described in several places in the specification, the periods are represented by “1” and “2.”

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-7 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,765,143 to Sheldon (Sheldon) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,596 to Wojcik (Wojcik) and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0082893 to Barts (Barts). The Office Action took the position that Sheldon discloses some features of claims 1-3 and 6. The Office Action then cited Wojcik and Barts to cure the deficiencies of Sheldon. It is respectfully submitted that the claims recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in Sheldon, Wojcik, and Barts.

Independent claim 1, upon which claims 2-4, 6, and 7 are dependent, recites an order management system for managing orders of resources for production of products, configured by a computer having an input device and an image displaying device that includes a storage device for storing an order management table indicating an order quantity and a required quantity of resources of each period among a plurality of periods. The system also includes first ordering means retrieving required quantity of resources of each period from the storage device, and transmitting a first order information indicating required quantity of resources of each period directly as an order quantity to an order received management terminal by a network, and required quantity determination means

for retrieving from the storage means, the order management table showing the order quantity of resources of each period indicated as the first order information transmitted by the first ordering means, and displaying the order management table on the image displaying device. The system additionally includes correction means for correcting the required quantities of resources in one or more periods included in a second predetermined period following a first predetermined period to decrease when the required quantities of resources in one or more periods included in the first predetermined period are corrected to increase by a user's operation of the input device, wherein the decreased amount of the required quantities corresponds to the increased amount of the required quantities. The system further includes second ordering means for determining latest order quantity of resources in each period included in the first predetermined period to equal to the required quantity of resources in each period included in the first period, and determining latest order quantity of resources in each period included in the second predetermined period to equal to the required quantity of the resources in each period of the second predetermined period corrected by the correction means, and then transmitting a second order information indicating latest order quantity of resources of each period included in each of the first predetermined period and the second predetermined period to the order received management terminal by a network.

As will be discussed below, the combination of Sheldon, Wojcik, and Barts fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of any of the presently pending claims.

Sheldon generally describes a computer system and computer-implemented method for controlling inventory of vendors at one level of a part distribution chain. The system includes a computer programmed with software for generating order data in response to reference data indicative of sales, inventory, demographics, and/or market characteristics of or pertaining to at least two vendors at the same distribution level. See abstract of Sheldon.

Wojcik generally describes a system of this invention manages customer orders using vendor supplied software systems interfaced on a real time basis to touch the data in each system on a real time basis. Wojcik generally describes that there is horizontal communication between the various components of the system such as inventory, purchasing, order management and receipt, logistics and inventory to have continual data flow without using a vertical software interface. See abstract of Wojcik.

Barts generally describes a product delivery system that moves products from manufacturing plant to destination. Barts generally describes that particularly applicable to the delivery of vehicles from vehicle assembly plants to dealerships, the system utilizes a centralized management organization overseeing independent entities in a delivery network, and provides a management team with improved visibility of and improved tools for operating the network. See abstract of Barts.

It is respectfully submitted that Wojcik fails to teach or suggest, at least, “correction means for correcting the required quantities of resources in one or more periods included in a second predetermined period following a first predetermined period

to decrease when the required quantities of resources in one or more periods included in the first predetermined period are corrected to increase by a user's operation of the input device, wherein the decreased amount of the required quantities corresponds to the increased amount of the required quantities," as recited in independent claim 1.

On page 4, the Office Action took the position that column 18, lines 35-50, of Wojcik disclose correction means for correcting the required quantities of resources in the plurality of periods. However, Wojcik does not disclose or suggest such correction means as recited in independent claim 1. Wojcik merely describes correcting inventory problems such as wrong location of storage of products, wrong SKU number or lot problem. See column 18, lines 35-50, of Wojcik.

It is respectfully submitted that Wojcik fails to disclose or suggest, at least, "correction means for correcting the required quantities of resources in one or more periods included in a second predetermined period following a first predetermined period to decrease when the required quantities of resources in one or more periods included in the first predetermined period are corrected to increase by a user's operation of the input device, wherein the decreased amount of the required quantities corresponds to the increased amount of the required quantities," as recited in independent claim 1. The Office Action implicitly acknowledged that Sheldon and Barts fail to disclose or suggest correcting step.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Sheldon, Wojcik, and Barts fails to disclose all of the elements of independent claim 1. As such, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Wojcik fails to teach or suggest, at least, “second ordering means for determining latest order quantity of resources in each period included in the first predetermined period to equal to the required quantity of resources in each period included in the first period, and determining latest order quantity of resources in each period included in the second predetermined period to equal to the required quantity of the resources in each period of the second predetermined period corrected by the correction means, and then transmitting a second order information indicating latest order quantity of resources of each period included in each of the first predetermined period and the second predetermined period to the order received management terminal by a network,” as recited in independent claim 1.

On page 4, the Office Action also took the position that paragraph [0137] of Barts discloses second ordering means for creating second order information. However, Barts does not disclose or suggest, at least, “second ordering means for determining latest order quantity of resources in each period included in the first predetermined period to equal to the required quantity of resources in each period included in the first period, and determining latest order quantity of resources in each period included in the second predetermined period to equal to the required quantity of the resources in each period of the second predetermined period corrected by the correction means, and then



transmitting a second order information indicating latest order quantity of resources of each period included in each of the first predetermined period and the second predetermined period to the order received management terminal by a network,” as recited in independent claim 1. Paragraph [0137] of Barts merely describes that the vehicle delivery system 10, feedback of information from the distribution network 20 and the data flow network 30 is used to schedule production of vehicles to produce level distribution of the product as it enters the delivery network, and to respond to output requirements of the transportation of the vehicles to market. Therefore, Barts fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 1.

The Office Action implicitly acknowledged that Sheldon and Wojcik also fail to disclose or suggest this feature. Thus, the combination of Barts, Sheldon, and Wojcik fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “second ordering means for determining latest order quantity of resources in each period included in the first predetermined period to equal to the required quantity of resources in each period included in the first period, and determining latest order quantity of resources in each period included in the second predetermined period to equal to the required quantity of the resources in each period of the second predetermined period corrected by the correction means, and then transmitting a second order information indicating latest order quantity of resources of each period included in each of the first predetermined period and the second predetermined period to the order received management terminal by a network,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheldon in view of Wojcik and Barts and further in view of Muraoka. The Office Action took the position that Sheldon discloses some features of claim 4. The Office Action then cited Muraoka, Wojcik, and Barts to cure the deficiencies of Sheldon. It is respectfully submitted that the claims recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in Sheldon, Wojcik, Barts, and Muraoka.

Muraoka generally describes a system of this invention manages customer orders using vendor supplied software systems interfaced on a real time basis to touch the data in each system on a real time basis. In effect, there is horizontal communication between the various components of the system such as inventory, purchasing, order management and receipt, logistics and inventory to have continual data flow without using a vertical software interface. See abstract of Muraoka.

The Office Action asserted that column 3, lines 34-55, Muraoka discloses production plan creation means for creating production plans of products sequentially. However, Muraoka merely describes a load partitioning production management. Muraoka does not disclose or suggest **creating** production plans of products **sequentially**, wherein said required quantity determination means determines latest required quantities of resources **based on a latest production plan** created by the production plan creation means.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Barts, Sheldon, and Wojcik also fails to disclose or suggest this creating step and the Office Action explicitly

admitted that Sheldon does not disclose this creating step. Therefore, Muraoka does not cure the deficiencies of Barts, Sheldon, and Wojcik. Thus, the combination of Barts, Sheldon, Wojcik, and Muraoka fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 4. As such, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheldon in view of Wojcik and Barts and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2002/0019761 to Lidow (Lidow). The Office Action took the position that Sheldon discloses some features of claim 7. The Office Action then cited Lidow, Wojcik, and Barts to cure the deficiencies of Sheldon. It is respectfully submitted that the claims recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in Sheldon, Wojcik, Barts, and Lidow.

Lidow generally describes a supply chain server 74 performing rough cut capacity matching, by first assigning aggregated demand to particular suppliers that customers 72 have determined as their preferred suppliers. Each customer 72 will have its own definition of a preferred supplier and supply chain server 74 retains this information in its data banks for each customer part number. Supply chain server 74 tests to see if this default assignment of demand to each preferred supplier falls within the supply capacity constraints given by suppliers 76. See paragraph [0148] of Lidow.

It is respectfully submitted that Lidow fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “said second ordering means controls the upper limit on the basis of the information on the supply capacity of resources of the person receiving the orders acquired by the information acquiring means,” as recited in claim 7. As discussed above, Lidow merely

describes performing rough cut capacity matching. Lidow's system does not disclose or suggest second ordering means controlling the upper limit based on the supply capacity as recited in claim 7. Sheldon, Barts, and Wojcik also fail to disclose or suggest this feature.

Therefore, the combination of Sheldon, Barts, Wojcik, and Lidow fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 7. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 and 6-7 are dependent upon claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-4 and 6-7 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claim 1, and for the specific limitations recited therein. Thus, in view of foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2-4 and 6-7 be withdrawn.

For the reasons explained above, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1-17 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited art. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that all of claims 1-4, 6, and 7 be allowed, and that this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Sejoon Ahn  
Registration No. 58,959

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

SA:dc